



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,400	09/19/2006	Peter Hanssen	1103326-0913	2693
7470 7590 06/23/2010 WHITE & CASE LLP PATENT DEPARTMENT 1155 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 10036				
EXAMINER				
MCKINLEY, CHRISTOPHER BRIAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3781				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/23/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/593,400

Applicant(s)

HANSEN ET AL.

Examiner

CHRISTOPHER B. MCKINLEY

Art Unit

3781

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 16 and 17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 16 and 17 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/21/2009 and 9/19/2006
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janes Autonell (2002/0166869) in view of Burke (3,995,765). Janes Autonell discloses the limitations of the claims including a container (figs. 1-6) having a shell (1), closure (2), pivotal mounting (14), open (fig. 1) and closed positions (fig. 2), aperture (4), an additional button (5) and pills (15, 16, 17). Janes Autonell excludes what Burke teaches, detents (22) that are released by compressive forces (fig. 3A) thereby opening a closure and providing a child-proof feature to said closure. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Janes Autonell with detents actuated by compressive forces to provide a child-proofing means to said container.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as described in par. 2 above in view of Shaw (3,907,103). The references described in par. 2 above disclose the limitations of the claims substantially excluding what Shaw teaches, releasing pressure applied to at least one flexible point on a container shell (fig. 4) thereby providing a suitable actuating means. Therefore it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the references as described in par. 2 above with the application of pressure to at least one flexible point on the container shell instead of the directly the closure in order to facilitate design choice and conceal the detents making the container more aesthetically pleasing.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as described in par. 2 above in view of Harris (5,549,214). The references described in par. 2 above disclose the limitations of the claims substantially excluding what Harris teaches, a small sealable space (19) located in a closure thereby providing additional segregated storage space. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the references as described in par. 2 above with a small sealable space in said closure in order to provide a segregated storage space for pills and the like or other items.

Claims 10-13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as described in par. 2 above in view of Healy et al. (2006/0151496), hereinafter Healy. The references described in par. 2 above disclose the limitations of the claims substantially excluding what Healy teaches, two half portions (24A, 24B) forming a container and held together by a sleeve (30) wherein the two half portions are connected by a flexible hinge (36) and the two half portions are not connected prior to assembly of the container (fig. 3) thereby providing a suitable container forming means.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the references as described in par. 2 above with the aforementioned structural features in order to facilitate design choice, segregate items within the container and enhance the aesthetics of said container.

Conclusion

Applicant is duly reminded that a complete response must satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F. R. 1.111, including: "The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. A general allegation that the claims "define a patentable invention" without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. Moreover, "The prompt development of a clear Issue requires that the replies of the applicant meet the objections to and rejections of the claims." Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP 2163.06 and MPEP 714.02. The "disclosure" includes the claims, the specification and the drawings.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER B. MCKINLEY whose telephone number is (571)272-3370. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Stashick can be reached on (571) 272-4561. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Anthony Stashick/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3781

/C. B. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 3781